


Organization _____ Bldg./Room _____
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE


P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450
If Undeliverable Return In Ten Days

Official Business
Penalty For Private Use, \$300

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER



RETURN TO SENDER



NIXIE

891 DE 1 00 12/10/10

RETURN TO SENDER
ATTEMPTED - NOT KNOWN
UNABLE TO FORWARD

BC: 22313145030 *0294-00162-10-31

8918035267301450



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

[Handwritten initials]

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov
DOW Sep-10



MAILED

SEP 13 2010

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

MATTHEW J. PEIRCE, ESQ.
1550 STARLIGHT CANYON AVENUE
LAS VEGAS NV 89123

In re Patent No. 6,763,548 :
Issued: July 20, 2004 :
Application No. 10/090,127 : DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: March 5, 2002 :
For: VACUUM CLEANER :

This is a decision on the petition filed on June 1, 2010, under 37 CFR § 1.378(b) to accept the delayed payment of a maintenance fee for the above-identified patent.

The petition is dismissed.

37 CFR 1.33(b), which states.

(b) Amendments and other papers. Amendments and other papers, except for written assertions pursuant to § 1.27(c)(2)(ii) of this part, filed in the application must be signed by:

(1) A registered patent attorney or patent agent of record appointed in compliance with § 1.32(b);

(2) A registered patent attorney or patent agent not of record who acts in a representative capacity under the provisions of § 1.34;

(3) An assignee as provided for under § 3.71(b) of this chapter; or

(4) All of the applicants (§ 1.41(b)) for patent, unless there is an assignee of the entire interest and such assignee has taken action in the application in accordance with § 3.71 of this chapter.

An unsigned amendment (or other paper) or one not properly signed by a person having authority to prosecute the application is not entered. This applies, for instance, where the amendment (or other paper) is signed by only one of two applicants and the one signing has not been given a power of attorney by the other applicant.

The above petition was signed by only one inventor which is not proper.

If reconsideration of this decision is desired, a petition for reconsideration under 37 CFR 1.378(e) must be filed within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. No extension of this 2-month time limit can be granted under 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b). Any such petition for reconsideration must be accompanied by the petition fee of \$400.00 as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(f). The petition for reconsideration should include an exhaustive attempt to provide the lacking item(s) noted below, since, after a decision on the petition for reconsideration, no further reconsideration or review of the matter will be undertaken by the Director.

The patent issued on July 20, 2004. The patent expired on July 21, 2008, for failure to timely submit the first maintenance fee.

Petitioner assert that the delay was unavoidable because petitioner hired Advent Patent Development to file the patent and to walk him through the patent process and that Advent Patent Development hired Matthew J. Peirce in Nevada to process his patent application.

Petitioners further states that, "At this time I don't think he's in business any more because he never forwarded me the patent maintenance dues. I tried to reach him and he's no where to be found.

I never received any mailing from the Patent Office or Matthew J. Peirce about my patent needing the maintenance fees paid."

A petition to accept the delayed payment of a maintenance fee under 35 USC 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b) must be accompanied by (1) an adequate, verified showing that the delay was unavoidable, since reasonable care was taken to ensure that the maintenance fee would be paid timely and that the petition was filed promptly after the patentee was notified of, or otherwise became aware of, the expiration of the patent, (2) payment of the appropriate

maintenance fee, unless previously submitted, and (3) payment of the surcharge set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(i)(1).

This petition lacks item (1) above.

The Director may accept late payment of the maintenance fee if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been "unavoidable".¹

A late maintenance fee is considered under the same standard as that for reviving an abandoned application under 35 U.S.C. § 133 because 35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1) uses identical language (i.e. "unavoidable delay").² Decisions reviving abandoned applications have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable.³ In this regard:

The word 'unavoidable' . . . is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through the unforeseen fault or imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.⁴

As 35 U.S.C. § 41(c) requires the payment of fees at specified intervals to maintain a patent in force, rather than some

¹ 35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1).

² Ray v. Lehman, 55 F.3d 606, 608-09, 34 USPQ2d 1786, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (quoting In re Patent No. 4,409,763, 7 USPQ2d 1798, 1800 (Comm'r Pat. 1989)).

³ Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887) (the term "unavoidable" "is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business").

⁴ In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (1912) (quoting Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (1887)); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 USPQ 666, 167-68 (D.D.C. 1963), aff'd, 143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable." Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

response to a specific action by the Office under 35 U.S.C. § 133, a reasonably prudent person in the exercise of due care and diligence would have taken steps to ensure the timely payment of such maintenance fees.⁵ That is, an adequate showing that the delay was "unavoidable" within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3) requires a showing of the steps taken to ensure the timely payment of the maintenance fees for this patent.⁶

In the present case, patentee apparently relied on Advent Patent Development appointee Matthew J. Peirce, to monitor and pay the maintenance fee as necessary. However the patent counsel or agent failed to timely pay the maintenance fee.

Unfortunately, the showing of record is that due to miscommunication between patentee and counsel, the maintenance fee for this patent was not paid. Delay resulting from a failure in communication between a client and a registered practitioner is not unavoidable delay.⁷ Specifically, delay resulting from a lack of proper communication between a patent holder and a registered representative as to who bore the responsibility for payment of a maintenance fee does not constitute unavoidable delay within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 41(c), and 37 CFR 1.378(b).⁸ Furthermore, while petitioner allegedly chose to rely upon counsel, such reliance per se does not provide petitioner with a showing of unavoidable delay within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b).⁹ Rather, reliance merely shifts the focus of the inquiry from petitioner to whether counsel acted reasonably and prudently.¹⁰ Nevertheless, petitioners are bound by any errors that may have been committed by counsel.¹¹ Moreover, the Office is not the proper forum for resolving a dispute as to the effectiveness of communications between parties regarding the responsibility for paying a maintenance fee.¹²

Therefore, any showing of unavoidable delay must include a statement from petitioner's patent attorney, as well as any other

⁵ Ray, 55 F.3d at 609, 34 USPQ2d at 1788.

⁶ Id.

⁷ In re Kim, 12 USPQ2d 1595 (Comm'r Pat., 1988).

⁸ See Ray, at 619, 34 USPQ2d at 1789.

⁹ See California Medical Products v. Technol Med. Prod., 921 F. Supp. 1219, 1259. (D. Del. 1995).

¹⁰ Id.

¹¹ California, supra.

¹² Id.

attorney(s) of record during the period that payment of the maintenance fee was delayed, as to why action was not taken to timely submit the required maintenance fee while the patent was under that agent's control. Petitioner should send a letter (accompanied by a copy of this decision) to Peirce by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, indicating to the agent that the USPTO is requesting his assistance in determining the circumstances surrounding the expiration of this patent, and is specifically requesting Peirce to provide a statement as to: (1) whether, and when, he first became aware that the first maintenance fee for this patent was due, and (2) why the maintenance fee was not timely submitted. Such statements should be accompanied by copies of any documents relevant to payment of the maintenance fee. In the event that Peirce fails to provide a statement within a person (e.g. within one (1) month) specified in such letter, petitioner should submit a copy of such letter and the return receipt indicating its delivery to the patent attorney or agent with any petition for reconsideration under 37 CFR 1.378(e).

Petitioner is reminded that any errors or omissions of patent counsel Matthew J. Peirce did not relieve petitioner from his obligation to exercise diligence with respect to this patent.¹³ In the absence of an adequate showing of petitioners' diligence in this matter throughout the period in question, the actions or inactions of the patent counsel or agent will remain imputed to petitioner.¹⁴

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office must rely on the actions or inactions of duly authorized and voluntarily chosen representatives of the applicant, and applicant is bound by the consequences of those actions or inactions.¹⁵ Specifically petitioners' delay caused by the mistakes or negligence of their voluntarily chosen representative does not constitute unavoidable delay within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1) or 37 CFR 1.378(b).¹⁶ Petitioners were not forced, but rather made a conscious decision to obtain the services of the chosen representative in payment of the maintenance fees for this

¹³ Douglas v. Manbeck, 1991 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16404, 21 USPQ2d 1697, 1700 (E.D. Pa. 1991), *aff'd*, 975 F.2d 869, 24 USPQ2d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (applicant's failure over two and one half year period, to exercise any diligence in prosecuting his application overcame and superseded any omissions on the part of his representative).

¹⁴ See In re Lonardo, 17 USPQ2d 1455 (Comm'r Pat. 1990).

¹⁵ Link v. Wabash, 370 U.S. 626, 633-34 (1962).

¹⁶ Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 5 USPQ2d 1130 (D. Ind. 1987); Smith v. Diamond, 209 USPQ 1091 (D.D.C. 1981); Potter v. Dann, 201 USPQ 574 (D.D.C. 1978); Ex parte Murray, 1891 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 130, 131 (Comm'r Pat. 1891).

patent, and therefore must be held accountable for his actions, or lack thereof, before the Office.

Further, a patentee's lack of knowledge of the need to pay the maintenance fee and the failure to receive the Maintenance Fee Reminder do not constitute unavoidable delay.¹⁷ Under the statute and regulations, the Office has no duty to notify patentees of the requirement to pay maintenance fees or to notify patentees when the maintenance fees are due. The Office's mailing of Maintenance Fee Reminders is carried out strictly as a courtesy. Accordingly, it is solely the responsibility of the patentee to assure that the maintenance fee is timely paid to prevent expiration of the patent. The lack of knowledge of the requirement to pay a maintenance fee and/or the failure to receive the Maintenance Fee Reminder will not shift the burden of monitoring the time for paying a maintenance fee from the patentee to the Office.¹⁸

In summary, the showing of record does not support a finding of unavoidable delay. A delay resulting from a lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice, or the MPEP does not constitute an "unavoidable" delay.¹⁹ Additionally, petitioners' preoccupation with other matters which took precedence over the above-identified maintenance fee does not constitute unavoidable delay.²⁰

Petitioners should note that if this petition is not renewed, or if renewed and not granted, then the maintenance fee and post-expiration surcharge are refundable. The \$400.00 petition fee for seeking reconsideration is not refundable. Any request for refund should be in writing to the address noted below.

The file does not indicate a change of address has been submitted, although the address given on the petition differs from the address of record. If appropriate, a change of address should be filed in accordance with MPEP 601.03. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the address given on the

¹⁷ See Patent No. 4,409,763, *supra*; see also "Final Rules for Patent Maintenance Fees" 49 Fed. Reg. 34716, 34722-34723 (August 31, 1984), reprinted in 1046 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 28, 34 (September 25, 1984).

¹⁸ *Rydeen v. Quigg*, 748 F. supp. at 900.

¹⁹ See *Haines v. Quigg*, 673 F. Supp. 314, 317, 5 USPQ 1130, 1132 (N.D. Ind. 1987), *Vincent v. Mossinghoff*, 230 USPQ 621, 624 (D.D.C. 1985); *Smith v. Diamond*, 209 USPQ 1091 (D.D.C. 1981); *Potter v. Dann*, 201 USPQ 574 (D.D.C. 1978); *Ex parte Murray*, 1891 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 130, 131 (1891).

²⁰ See *Smith v. Mossinghoff*, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982).

petition; however, the Office will mail all future correspondence solely to the address of record.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be delivered through one of the following mediums:

By mail: Mail Stop PETITIONS
 Commissioner for Patents
 Post Office Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: Customer Service Window
 Mail Stop Petitions
 Randolph Building
 401 Dulany Street
 Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax: (571) 273-8300
 ATTN: Office of Petitions

By internet: EFS-Web
 www.uspto.gov/ebs/efs_help.html
 (for help using EFS-Web call the
 Patent Electronic Business Center
 at (866) 217-9197)

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3208.

/KOC/
Karen Creasy
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions

Cc:

**RUBEN BIRLE
709 S. AGATE STREET
ANAHEIM CA 92804**